



From the Belfast News-Letter.

#### BELFAST ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

On Tuesday evening, a very numerous and respectable public meeting was held in the Independent Meeting-House, Donegall-street, in furtherance of the objects of the above-named Association. The interest attaching to this meeting was greatly enhanced by a previous announcement, circulated by placards, that Mr. FREDERICK DOUGLASS (who has returned to Belfast from England, where he has been, on his great mission; for a fortnight) would address the meeting. At half-past 7, although the admission was not gratuitous, the meeting-house was crowded to excess, not a spare seat attainable. The platform was occupied by a large number of the clergy of the town, and of the influential laity who have evinced so creditable an interest in the abolition of slavery in the United States. The meeting having been constituted in the customary manner,

The chair was taken by James Gibson, Esq., amidst loud cheering. After making some pertinent introductory remarks, he introduced Mr. Douglass to the meeting.

Mr. DOUGLASS was received with loud plaudits.

He spoke as follows—Ladies and gentlemen, one of the most painful duties I have been called upon to perform in the advocacy of the Abolition of Slavery, has been to expose the corruption and sinful position of the American Churches with regard to that question. That was almost the only duty which, when I commenced the advocacy of this cause, I felt inclined to shrink from. Really, any attempt to expose the inconsistencies of the religious organizations of our land is the most painful undertaking.

I had always looked upon these churches as possessing, in a superlative degree, the love of virtue and of justice—the love of humanity—the love of God. I had not supposed that they were capable of descending to the low and mean act of upholding and sustaining a system, by which three millions of people have been divested of every right and privilege which they ought to enjoy. (Hear.) But, in examining into the character of these churches, I was led to see, that unless the deeds of these ministers were made known—unless the light of truth should be permitted to shine into their dark recesses—there will be forever a sink of iniquity in the midst of them. The only way of purifying our church from the deep damnation into which she was plunging, was to expose her deeds to the light. But, in exposing these deeds, I do not wish to place myself in the position of an enemy. Let no man rank me among the enemies of the church, or of religion, because I dare to remove the mask from her face, and give the nations a peep at her enormities. It is for her salvation and purification I do it, and for the redemption and disenthralment of my race. (Hear.)

I was exceedingly pleased to hear, at the meeting before the last, that the minister who occupies the pulpit of this house, (Mr. Hodges,) welcomed me to this platform, within these walls, before these people, to expose the corruptions of the Congregational Church of America. It was a noble act, which must identify the Rev. gentleman with the friends of truth. It displayed a consciousness of innocence on his part, or, at least, an openness and a magnanimity, that are ever associated with innocence—(hear)—and a willingness for self-examination seldom displayed. Innocence, you know, lives in the sunlight—it rushes out into the day—it asks to be examined, and searched, and tried. (Hear, hear, hear.) This is its language. You never hear it, crying, 'Rocks, cover us; and Mountains, on us fall, and hide us from the face of Truth and Justice.' This is the language of guilt—of those convinced of their own iniquity. Innocence never bows and bars its meeting-house doors, to shut out the light, nor hides itself behind some 'important engagement.' (Hear, and laugh.) It never does any such thing as this. It rushes forth to be seen. Its element is the light. It opens its own eyes, and is willing to have the eyes of the world opened on itself. It is glorious, and I love it. The nature of guilt was never set forth more clearly in a few words than by the Blessed Redeemer, when he said, that 'it bathed the light, neither cometh to the light lest its deeds be revealed.' Eighteen hundred years ago, as it is now, was the reason obvious—because God looks on sin with no degree of allowance; and truth will not hold that man guiltless, who, in the light of the nineteenth century, upholds American Slavery, in any shape or form whatever. (Cheers.)

Before entering on the subject of my discourse at large, I beg to say a few words as to a question among you. One of these means taken to destroy the influence of these lectures has been that of circulating a suspicion, that I am not a really sincere person—that my character is not good. 'He may be an impostor,' has been the word. I am not an impostor. If those who insinuate that I am one can prove it, I shall be as ready as any one to give way. Besides, I would inform this audience, that the story that I am here without orders, is absolutely false. I have quite a number of distinguished Abolitionists of the day, who are in Ireland for months, and have delivered upwards of fifty lectures in different parts of the country, and it was not until I reached Belfast, that I had been even asked for credentials. No enquiries were made of me in Dublin, for I had been known to the Abolitionists of that city for the last four years, through the American papers. They knew me, and understood me, and had heard about me, and I had no need of showing them even a letter of introduction. I had no need of one. But, what sensible people you are in Belfast! (Laughter.) How cautious less they should make a mistake! How prudent they are, and how desirous of being placed on a sure footing, lest they should take into fellowship such characters as won't bear examination—especially how they receive a fugitive slave! But when the Free Church of Scotland is—(hear, hear)—Well, I won't say another word about them.

One of the prevalent apologies for the American slaveholders is, that the laws of the States, or at least of several of them, are such as to deprive the masters of the privilege of emancipating the slaves. This is the objection made by every apologist for Christian union with the slaveholders. My motto is, 'NO UNION WITH THE SLAVEHOLDERS.' (Cheers.) Because, I believe there can be no union between light and darkness. You cannot serve God and Mammon. Justice can have no fellowship with injustice. Liberty can have no fellowship with slavery. But those who go for uniting with slaveholders, must always have some strong cause for their conduct. Such as this, there are, it appears a number of good slaveholders in the States, whose breasts are overburdened with sorrow on being placed in such an unhappy relation to their slaves—(hear)—and there are 'circumstances over which they have no control,' and so forth, and so forth. (Laughter at the droll manner in which the speaker intimated his words.) Persons situated as these slaveholders are, and so forth—(Laughter)—cannot be held accountable for the evil, when they cannot help themselves; and so forth; but they would very gladly get rid of the law—(hear)—and so forth. (Continued laughter.) I pronounce this apology to be a falsehood. There is not a slaveholder in any State, who may not, if he will, emancipate his slaves, by taking them across Mason's and Dixon's line, and all the apologies built upon this supposition—all the arguments founded upon it—must fall to the ground. When they presume to offer this excuse, tell them of Brisbane of South Carolina, who, when he became sensible of the guilt of holding slaves, took them to Ohio, and then went to work with his own hands, like an honest man. (Cheers.) If any other instances are required, take that of James G. Birney, who emancipated his slaves, and a hundred of others. But, besides this, there are, in fact, only two or three of the States, in which it is necessary to remove the slaves which are emancipated. There are twelve States, in which the master may emancipate his slaves, and so forth. (Laughter at the droll manner in which the speaker intimated his words.) Persons situated as these slaveholders are, and so forth—(Laughter)—cannot be held accountable for the evil, when they cannot help themselves; and so forth; but they would very gladly get rid of the law—(hear)—and so forth. (Continued laughter.) I pronounce this apology to be a falsehood. There is not a slaveholder in any State, who may not, if he will, emancipate his slaves, by taking them across Mason's and Dixon's line, and all the apologies built upon this supposition—all the arguments founded upon it—must fall to the ground. When they presume to offer this excuse, tell them of Brisbane of South Carolina, who, when he became sensible of the guilt of holding slaves, took them to Ohio, and then went to work with his own hands, like an honest man. (Cheers.)

(Continued) If any other instances are required, take that of James G. Birney, who emancipated his slaves, and a hundred of others. But, besides this, there are, in fact, only two or three of the States, in which it is necessary to remove the slaves which are emancipated. There are twelve States, in which the master may emancipate his slaves, and so forth. (Laughter at the droll manner in which the speaker intimated his words.) Persons situated as these slaveholders are, and so forth—(Laughter)—cannot be held accountable for the evil, when they cannot help themselves; and so forth; but they would very gladly get rid of the law—(hear)—and so forth. (Continued laughter.) I pronounce this apology to be a falsehood. There is not a slaveholder in any State, who may not, if he will, emancipate his slaves, by taking them across Mason's and Dixon's line, and all the apologies built upon this supposition—all the arguments founded upon it—must fall to the ground. When they presume to offer this excuse, tell them of Brisbane of South Carolina, who, when he became sensible of the guilt of holding slaves, took them to Ohio, and then went to work with his own hands, like an honest man. (Cheers.)

WORSHIPPERS OF MAMMON. Parker Pillsbury, Editor of the Concord, N. H. Herald, says of a class of our fellow-citizens of the Bay State:—'They talk of our holy religion; but their robes of righteousness are woven at Lowell and Manchester; their Paradise is high per cent on Factory stocks; their palms of victory and crowns of rejoicing are triumphs over a rival party in politics on the questions of Banks and Tariffs. They would turn Heaven into Birmingham, make every angel a weaver, and with eternal din of looms and spindles drown all the anthems of the morning stars.'

H. C. WORTH'S LETTERS. Among the raciest and most instructive Foreign Letters that we have seen in any of our American journals, are those of HENRY C. WORTH of Philadelphia, communicated to the Boston Liberator. He has a fine talent for observation, a highly thoughtful and philosophic sense of mind, and generally makes down such incidents and reflections as other writers overlook and neglect. In our next we may give several columns of extracts from his journal, which no one can read but with the keenest interest.—*Yankee Blade.*

in the slave's presence, then in the slaveholder stung to the very quick, and he behaves more like a dog than a man. Oh, yes—our hearts leap up at the very name of freedom, while we recoil with horror at the sound of slavery. We feel, then, that the slaveholder is a wrong-doer, and we know that wrong-doers can have no fellowship with the mock and lowly Jesus.

It is said, we ought not to enter into people's motives. I don't want to do so. I only speak what I know. I may be told, 'Judge not, that ye be not judged?' I admit the truth of this part of scripture, but those who read it to me, should read a little further, when it is said, 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' (Cheers.) I do not judge you when you eat me, if I cry out that you hurt me. (Hear.) It is not judging the state of your soul, when I tell you, that you have done me an injury. I know that, by injuring me, you are acting contrary to Christianity; and when you tell me that there are some Christian slaveholders in the States, I tell you, as well might you talk of sober drunkards. (Laughter.) Just as if the lash in the hands of a Christian is not as injurious to my back, as it would be in the hands of a wicked man. (Hear, hear.) As far as my experience goes, I would rather suffer under the hands of the latter; and I tell you, as I have mentioned in my narrative, that next to being a slave, there is no greater calamity than being the slave of a Christian slaveholder. (Hear.) I say this from my own experience, and it is further proved by theory. There is a reason for it. When the finest, the most excellent bodies are decomposed, they become the most corrupt and offensive. So when the most excellent element is perverted to a base use, it becomes the basest and most hateful in itself—so the religious element raises up and stamps man with the image of God, when pure—but, when perverted, it makes him a fallen angel, and sinks him among demons. A man becomes the more cruel, the more religious element is perverted in him. It was so with my master.

Some persons have taken offence at my saying that slaveholders become worse after their conversion, and it was thought that I was hereby injuring the cause of religion; but I say this, on the same principle upon which Christ denounced the Scribes and Pharisees, when he said they would compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and after they had made him, he wretched the child of hell was before them. They do make proselytes, and convert men to what they call religion, but their converts are still in the gall of bitterness, and the bonds of iniquity. Why is it, if this be not the case? because they are woman-whippers, cradle plunderers and man-stealers before their conversion, they are woman-whippers, cradle plunderers and man-stealers after it—hear)—and that 'religion' is to them but an additional stimulus to re-enact these atrocious deeds?

The proposition to purchase Cuba has awakened the Habeneros and the people of the Island generally,

to the merits of the question, and induced them as one man to reflect upon a union with the U. S. States, at no distant day. One of Havana's principal merchants, a very intelligent old Spaniard, has given me all the objections which are urged against the measure in Havana, and I will relate them to you at some other time. He assured me, however, that a strong party in Cuba is in favor of it.

Thus slowly the scheme moves on.

#### SLAVERY IN BRAZIL.

U. S. FRIGATE CONGRESS, RIO DE JANEIRO, January 6, 1846.

The condition of the slave population here is much less abject and wretched than I expected to find it. Slaves are generally treated with kindness and humanity. Their color operates less to their prejudice than with us. Their freedom in many cases lies within their reach, and may be attained, as it often is, by a few years of industry and frugality. The owner who should attach an exorbitant value to a slave, desirous of purchasing his freedom, would be severely censured. When free, he goes to the ballot-box, and is eligible to a seat in the national legislature. Nor would any body here propose to sell a slave who would marry a woman whose color should be a shade lighter than his own. It is for us to preach up humanity, freedom, and equality, and then turn up our blessed noses if an African takes a seat at the same table on board a steam-boat! and even in our churches be obliged to look out some obscure nook, and dodge along toward heaven, like a man who has no business travelling on the narrow way? The misery is, that they who preach equality the loudest, are generally the last to put it in practice. It is one thing to level downwards—it is a very different thing to level upwards. Give me the man whose favors are like the rays of the sun, if they first strike the loftiest objects, it is only that they may glance in the valleys.

THE SEDITION LAW.

Mr. Douglass continued to address the meeting, for nearly an hour further, on the subject of the Church of Scotland, in reference to American slavery, but we are obliged to curtail the reporter's notes.]

From the Lexington, Ky., True American.

#### THE SEDITION LAW.

It will be seen from the act of the Kentucky Legislature, in to-day's paper, that the sedition law has dwindled down into a very harmless affair. After the infamous and cowardly mob of the 18th, and the reappearance of the True American, the poor mobsters, who have become the laughing stock of the very boys in the streets, some of them being even hairy in effigy, seeing that they had laid off their tins in the absence of the legal owner, appropriating them to their own use, whilst the living editor was walking about among them, consoling themselves by nodding their heads and saying, 'never mind, we'll have him in the penitentiary yet.' Sure enough, when the Legislature met, a bill was brought in, utterly destroying the liberty of the press, and making the circulation of the Bible, and the Declaration of Independence, by calculating to excite slaves to insubordination!—FENAL!

The Tolosco Interest in the States were the foremost in this matter, with some honorable exceptions; but failing to play the tyrant over their own citizens by disregarding every principle of reason, justice, the common law, the Constitution and common sense, in their usual spirit of kicking the breeches of Northern men, they extended their laws over the Free States. Of course, when it came to the lower house, this Quixotic law was cut up—gutted, as some of the members vaunted. The nation will no doubt be surprised to find the more numerous body of the Legislature, composed mostly of young men, sitting as censors, and correcting the foibles of grave senators! But they must remember, that the senate is of the old dynasty, and knows not of the young Giant Liberty, which is arousing itself among the people of this generation. We had the pleasure of looking in upon the House, and hearing many members priding themselves that the monster 'was gutted—made its dying effort—never to rally again.' And so we venture to say it will be forever. In the mean time, we ask our worthy the freeholders thousand white slave-holders, to use those tools of encumberers, who were willing to sell our liberties for gold, meet the storm of traitors; and whenever they present themselves at the polls for office, let us see if we can't find some other men than they, to represent FREEMEN. For we now—indeed, the Kentucky Legislature has refused to stand by the side of the 18th of August, to give us a chance to stand by the 3rd of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March, and the 1st of April, and the 1st of May, and the 1st of June, and the 1st of July, and the 1st of August, and the 1st of September, and the 1st of October, and the 1st of November, and the 1st of December, and the 1st of January, and the 1st of February, and the 1st of March



## THE REFORMATORY.

From the Christian World.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.  
EXPOSITION OF THE NINTH CHAPTER OF GENESIS.

1818.

There are two modes of dealing with a subject of reform in institutions: one positive, laying open the foundation principles of your own faith; the other negative, answering objections of opponents.

The negative side makes a large part of the work of all reforms. The old thought, on which an institution stands, is in the way of the new thought, opposes all its declarations, and must be answered to the uttermost. No matter whether the objection has any thing in it to you, or me, it has to some body. It is made; and the new truth must answer it, always can answer it, putting it forever out of the way, and going then forward to establish itself.

Especially on the subject of abolishing capital punishment, the negative side is full. Church and State are to be answered. Human law here claims the sanction of the divine will upon its reasons of civil policy. The church interprets the Bible to command capital punishment, and the state seeks to found its statute on the Bible, so interpreted.

The support which capital punishment is supposed to have from the Bible, is popularly called the scriptural argument; and this scriptural argument rests mainly on the ninth chapter of Genesis—the revelation therein of God's law to Noah.

And it is to be taken, that the great body of all persons who are inclined to orthodox views of religion, with the orthodox clergy at their head, sincerely believe capital punishment sanctioned by the express revelation of the voice of God, in that chapter of Genesis. The shadow of this belief, more or less dark, as it may be, rests upon almost the whole heart of Christendom.

If we come to this chapter, prepared beforehand to find its authority for capital punishment, with minds filled with prejudices, leaving no room for a present judgment, we may find it such authority forever. But without such preparation and pre-occupation of mind, we shall find it no such thing. As we are in this respect, so is our interpretation likely to be. Let us dismiss prejudice, if so it may be; let us clear our hearts of the dark shadow, that we may have them open to the image of the shining truth.

Let us first read the chapter as it stands in our Bible—the first 7 verses—which belong together, and complete the whole of one subject matter:

1. And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth.

2. And the fear of you, and the dread of you, shall be upon every beast, upon the earth, and upon every fowl of the air, upon all the fishes of the sea: into your hand are they delivered.

3. Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you: even as the green herb have I given you, all things.

4. But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, ye shall not eat.

5. And surely your blood of your lives will I require: at the hand of every beast will I require it; and at the hand of man: at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man.

6. Whoso shedeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man.

7. And you, be ye fruitful, and multiply; bring forth abundantly in the earth, and multiply therein.

The common interpretation supposes that God will here have every man-slayer put to death, and has so appointed it here—that in the 5th and 6th verses lies the divine requirement of capital punishment. In the discussion, at the Broadway Tabernacle, in New-York, I have heard it was called the *privilege of God's moral universe*, resting its eternal basis here.First—it is to be noted, that if this be a divine requirement of capital punishment, it is only for man-slaying. There is no sanction here for the death penalty to be inflicted for any other crime—no warrant for it, except for *man-killing alone*—not for treason, nor rape, nor robbery, nor any other crime usually punished with death—only for the single fact of slaying a man.And it requires equally that you inflict the death penalty upon the beast that sheds man's blood, as well as man. And this the Mosaic law did. And in the old English law, a beast, or any other article of property, which was the cause of death to a human being, was forfeit to the king, or his devoted properties, and known in law as *deadstock*; whence *Deo dominus, to be given to God*. Whence the value of the deadstock for murder, or manslaughter, was the value of the deadstock for the rest of its life.

This subject matter of the statute restrains their own meaning itself. You must look elsewhere in the statutes to find provision for appeal in criminal cases: here is not its fitting place.

The title of the Noachic statute, if set forth after the manner of a law, would be as above stated: Murder would find no place in it; it would be wholly out of place in it. The shedding of blood spoken of, would be not at all in reference to the killing of man in anger, or revenge, or the like, but solely in reference to the main subject of the revelation in the statute, food—shedding man's blood.

Strikingly appropriate to this view is a familiar cause in the laws of England, used by Blackstone, to illustrate the rule of construction, that the subject matter is to determine the meaning of the words of a statute. The Pope of Rome claimed the right to appoint the clergy in England to the rich livings in the church, and receive pay for them, and these were called *provisions*. A law of Edward III forbids all ecclesiastical persons to purchase provisions at Rome. But no interpretation would make this prohibition against purchasing meat, grain, or any other virtual at Rome. The word 'provisions' have reference to the *subject matter* of the statute, which was wholly another thing.

The subject matter of this Noachic statute is the blood of the beast to be shed? Yet the divine law, if it must stand for divine in us, demands the sacrifice. We believe it not. We hang the man-murderer, only; we spare the beast-murderer, withholding him from the divine demand. Does any one of those who stand for this sanction of the death penalty, sacrifice to Deity the horse that has been kicked, and by kicking, killed a man? Yet, so to interpret the chapter, as to demand the human sacrifice, is also to demand that of the beast: 'And surely the blood of your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man; for in the image of God made he man.' Beast and man must equally die; and the insane man, as well as the sane; and the man who kills on sudden provocation, as well as on deliberate malice. Is this the law of our society? But this is the law of this chapter of Genesis, if you will interpret it for capital punishment.

Now if you depart from its authority, by dispensing with it, in the case of the beast; of the insane man, who, in the view of our society, is irresponsible, like the beast; of man-slayer in sudden passion; then you have used your discretion to set aside what you yet call a command of the Almighty, and you may not stop short. You may dispense with a part, in your discretion. Human discretion is your law, not the word of scripture. But is the man to be found in our society, who contends for the requirement of the whole of that scripture? Yet no part of it is more sacred than the rest; and if not the whole, then no part is sacred command to a man.

Then, you take the common interpretation, the divine demand of the civil magistrate, the divine command to the civil magistrate is just this—*not more; but let civilized society see to it, no less; death for him who kills a man, for no other crime; and death of beast killing a man, as well as man; and death of insane, as well as sane; and death for man-slaughter, as well as for murder*. But in neither of these last three cases could any called civilization law exact such penalty: any called civilized sect of religion be found to sustain it. Society, the sects do not allow their own interpretation; and shall they nevertheless sustain it. And we will now go on to seek, and set forth the true meaning of the text, from these sources.

Appealing from the English Bible three sources where to seek authentic justice, as far as in this time it can be had, are the original Hebrew, the Samaritan, and the Greek.

1. There stands the revelation, whatever it is, in James's Bible, even supposing the translation in our James's Bible to be correct. Bot that translation is incorrect. The 4th verse of it is wholly mistranslated. It can be shown, from a true translation of the original Hebrew text of the 4th verse, and from the Samaritan version, that the view above set forth is the exact word of scripture. The Septuagint version also, strongly and strikingly, though not conclusively, sustains it. And we will now go on to seek, and set forth the true meaning of the text, from these sources.

This is the only consistent exposition of the chapter, as it now stands, even supposing the translation in our James's Bible to be correct. Bot that translation is incorrect. The 4th verse of it is wholly mistranslated. It can be shown, from a true translation of the original Hebrew text of the 4th verse, and from the Samaritan version, that the view above set forth is the exact word of scripture. The Septuagint version also, strongly and strikingly, though not conclusively, sustains it. And we will now go on to seek, and set forth the true meaning of the text, from these sources.

The Greek word here used for soul, is *ψυχή* (as we know it, not unfamiliarly, by adoption into the modern languages, *psyche*) that word in Greek, which is appropriated to the human soul, ethereal, surviving the body, distinctive from the brute; and given, in animal nature, to the butterfly, as the image in outward life of the ethereal, transmigrating human soul; of its metamorphosis, and passage into the element of spiritual freedom, winged as the angel. The Greek called the human soul *ψυχή*; out of all the animal creation, he called the butterfly alone by the same name; and because it alone therein seemed to him the material image of his own soul, sculptured it on his tomb, as the emblem of immortality. (What shall we say to the Death's-head and cross-bones of Christianity, in the language of Greek?)

It is also true, that afterwards, in the law of Moses, the soul of all flesh is called its blood. In the 17th chapter of Leviticus, 10th and 11th verses, is the following passage:

10. And whatsoever man of the children of Israel, or of the foreigners who dwell among you, shall eat any kind of blood: I will set my face upon the soul that eats the blood, and will destroy it from its people.

11. For the soul of all flesh is its blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make propria-  
tion for your souls: for blood there shall make propria-  
tion for the soul.

Both these last relate back to the original Hebrew text, as their source. It only is final and decisive. If they should be found, to differ from it, they cannot stand; they are only translations of it, and should they be wrong translations, the meaning of the original, once ascertained, ends all dispute. The Samaritan, the Septuagint, every version will be nothing, if it does not render the meaning of the original.

And thereupon follows, in natural order, the prohibition to touch human flesh. Not now alone the vegetable of the garden, but the flesh of the animal world, whom you may eat—but there stand beware—let the blood of the animal suffice.

Whoso shall shed the blood of man, for meat, be it man or beast, shall have his own blood shed.

*For in the image of God made he man.* Then this has been meaning, which, on the usual mode of construction, is wholly contradictory: for God's image is as much violated in killing the murderer by the sentence of the law, as in the original death of the murdered. The animal, he bears not Jehovah's image, and him ye may say for food—but man is Jehovah's image. Touch him not.

And see the correspondence of the blessing of increase, and the appointment of food, in this chapter to Noah, and in the first chapter of Genesis, to Adam:

Gen. i. 29. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moves upon the earth.

29. And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed: to you it shall be for meat.

Nothing there of penalty for crime, and nothing al-

so here, in this 9th chapter. That was not the thing to be settled. There, as here, is the blessing of increase, and the assignment of food. Any such thing as penalty for crime, there, and here, is wholly incongruous.

The period for the annunciation of the municipal law is not as yet. That shall come by and by, in the progress of the race; but is not now. Now is the period of populating and subsisting. The municipal law grows into the state of declaration and permanent enactment afterward.

From the beginning of Genesis, down to the Mosaic code, from Cain down, no murder is mentioned in the Bible—and there are several—is stated to have been punished with death. Distinctly, the children of Jacob, Simeon and Levi, are related to have committed most treacherous murder, and their father pronounced the curse upon them for it. And Moses is related to have murdered the Egyptian. Yet they were not punished with death.

The time, the age did not interpret this law as demanding a penalty for the shedding of human blood in what we call murder. Contemporaneous expostion is reliable authority in all courts which administer law. What meaning did the age, which enacted a law, put upon it? Ask judges; and then that is known.

If we should set down the title of the divine statute contained in the first 7 verses of the 9th chapter of Genesis, it would stand thus:—Concerning Noah and his posterity: their blessing, their increase, their food.

In this scriptural statute, the mention of murder and its punishment would be as unfitting, as if, in a law of the United States, entitled, 'An Act concerning the distribution of the Public Lands,' you should find a denunciation of the slave trade as piracy, and the penalty of death for its punishment. In the one case, as in the other, the things do not belong together, never are naturally found together, by any thought of divine or human order shall never be set together. Nothing but the absolute certainty of language, leaving no room for interpretation, could make it possible to believe that the necessary fitness of things should be so transgressed.

In the 'Supplement to the Revised Statutes of Massachusetts,' stands an act entitled, 'An Act concerning the Supreme Judicial Court and Court of Common Pleas.' The 4th section of the act is as follows: 'There shall be no appeal from any judgment of the Court of Common Pleas upon the verdict of a jury; but all questions of law, except such as may arise on pleas of abatement, may be carried up to the Supreme Judicial Court by bill of exceptions, or writ of error.' And yet this statute does not take away from any criminal, found guilty by the verdict of a jury, the right of appeal. And why not? Simply because the *subject matter* of the law is found to be civil, and not criminal cases. Yet the words of the section are wholly general, and of themselves, do cover as well criminal as civil cases. The subject matter of the statute restricts their meaning itself. You must look elsewhere in the statutes to find provision for appeal in criminal cases: here is not its fitting place.

The title of the Noachic statute, if set forth after the manner of a law, would be as above stated: Murder would find no place in it; it would be wholly out of place in it. The shedding of blood spoken of, would be not at all in reference to the killing of man in anger, or revenge, or the like, but solely in reference to the main subject of the revelation in the statute, food—shedding man's blood.

The subject matter of the statute restrains their own meaning itself. You must look elsewhere in the statutes to find provision for appeal in criminal cases: here is not its fitting place.

With all, the dead means the rest possessed to start with, D'Olivet goes back to the soil in which the Hebrew tree grew. With his mystic botany he analyzes soil, air, still ministering elements; explores localities, and finds cognate products; understands at least the principle of life of the tree; and then gives us the resulting foliage, and flower, and fruit, in 'La Langue Hebreu Restituée.' The Hebrew Language Restored!

Another Curier, in the philosophy of language. Let us hear him.

His translation of the first three verses of the 9th chapter of Genesis, though differing from our Bible, has no particular bearing upon our present inquiry. The 4th verse he renders thus, literally:

'But the bodily shape having by the soul itself, the likeness its own, not shall you feed upon.'

And this he renders more freely, ('traduction corrente') thus:

'But the body's blood, with a soul like yours.'

On account of the likeness (in) blood,

I will avenge (it) at the hand of all living, and of man, (body and spirit).

The blood-spiller's blood will be split by the blood-like: for to his [image] God made the blood-like.

The sense of the 5th and 6th verses, as rendered by both D'Olivet and Dr. Krausius, seems essentially the same. Neither contains the denunciation of a penalty to be inflicted by law or institution. The 5th is the spirit: 'I will avenge it.'

The penalty is spiritual, and to touch all mankind, individually and collectively. Whatever is to come of the act of shedding man's blood for food, is to be of God. He may use man, as his instrumentality, or he may not. But he is to avenge, in the universal consequences of the violation of the sanctity of the human soul, the image of the divine. And the mode in which these consequences are to manifest themselves is indicated (not perhaps obscurely) to be of God, but more or less clearly, as each has inward experience that the dimensions of sin are not so much special as all but universal after this manner. We are all alike of one blood, soul, kind. Ye are all kin to each, each to all. Ye are all members of the same family. He who touches the life of his kind to sustain his own, violates his own life, the life and image of God. He violates the soul, the soul of mankind, his own soul also. And on all mankind, as well as on him, must the judgment fall. It is given to each, to each to all, must the judgment fall. A father's and mother's soul is in the interpretation of all his works. It is God's greatest creation, and to touch all mankind, individually and collectively. Whatever is to come of the act of shedding man's blood for food, is to be of God. He may use man, as his instrumentality, or he may not. But he is to avenge, in the universal consequences of the violation of the sanctity of the human soul, the image of the divine. And the mode in which these consequences are to manifest themselves is indicated (not perhaps obscurely) to be of God, but more or less clearly, as each has inward experience that the dimensions of sin are not so much special as all but universal after this manner. We are all alike of one blood, soul, kind. Ye are all kin to each, each to all. Ye are all members of the same family. He who touches the life of his kind to sustain his own, violates his own life, the life and image of God. He violates the soul, the soul of mankind, his own soul also. And on all mankind, as well as on him, must the judgment fall. A father's and mother's soul is in the interpretation of all his works. It is God's greatest creation, and to touch all mankind, individually and collectively. Whatever is to come of the act of shedding man's blood for food, is to be of God. He may use man, as his instrumentality, or he may not. But he is to avenge, in the universal consequences of the violation of the sanctity of the human soul, the image of the divine. And the mode in which these consequences are to manifest themselves is indicated (not perhaps obscurely) to be of God, but more or less clearly, as each has inward experience that the dimensions of sin are not so much special as all but universal after this manner. We are all alike of one blood, soul, kind. Ye are all kin to each, each to all. Ye are all members of the same family. He who touches the life of his kind to sustain his own, violates his own life, the life and image of God. He violates the soul, the soul of mankind, his own soul also. And on all mankind, as well as on him, must the judgment fall. A father's and mother's soul is in the interpretation of all his works. It is God's greatest creation, and to touch all mankind, individually and collectively. Whatever is to come of the act of shedding man's blood for food, is to be of God. He may use man, as his instrumentality, or he may not. But he is to avenge, in the universal consequences of the violation of the sanctity of the human soul, the image of the divine. And the mode in which these consequences are to manifest themselves is indicated (not perhaps obscurely) to be of God, but more or less clearly, as each has inward experience that the dimensions of sin are not so much special as all but universal after this manner. We are all alike of one blood, soul, kind. Ye are all kin to each, each to all. Ye are all members of the same family. He who touches the life of his kind to sustain his own, violates his own life, the life and image of God. He violates the soul, the soul of mankind, his own soul also. And on all mankind, as well as on him, must the judgment fall. A father's and mother's soul is in the interpretation of all his works. It is God's greatest creation, and to touch all mankind, individually and collectively. Whatever is to come of the act of shedding man's blood for food, is to be of God. He may use man, as his instrumentality, or he may not. But he is to avenge, in the universal consequences of the violation of the sanctity of the human soul, the image of the divine. And the mode in which these consequences are to manifest themselves is indicated (not perhaps obscurely) to be of God, but more or less clearly, as each has inward experience that the dimensions of sin are not so much special as all but universal after this manner. We are all alike of one blood, soul, kind. Ye are all kin to each, each to all. Ye are all members of the same family. He who touches the life of his kind to sustain his own, violates his own life, the life and image of God. He violates the soul, the soul of mankind, his own soul also. And on all mankind, as well as on him, must the judgment fall. A father's and mother's soul is in the interpretation of all his works. It is God's greatest creation, and to touch all mankind, individually and collectively. Whatever is to come of the act of shedding man's blood for food, is to be of God. He may use man, as his instrumentality, or he may not. But he is to avenge, in the universal consequences of the violation of the sanctity of the human soul, the image of the divine. And the mode in which these consequences are to manifest themselves is indicated (not perhaps obscurely) to be of God, but more or less clearly, as each has inward experience that the dimensions of sin are not so much special as all but universal after this manner. We are all alike of one blood, soul, kind. Ye are all kin to each, each to all. Ye are all members of the same family. He who touches the life of his kind to sustain his own, violates his own life, the life and image of God. He violates the soul, the soul of mankind, his own soul also. And on all mankind, as well as on him, must the judgment fall. A father's and mother's soul is in the interpretation of all his works. It is God's greatest creation, and to touch all mankind, individually and collectively. Whatever is to come of the act of shedding man's blood for food, is to be of God. He may use man, as his instrumentality, or he may not. But he is to avenge, in the universal consequences of the violation of the sanctity of the human soul, the image of the divine. And the mode in which these consequences are to manifest themselves is indicated (not perhaps obscurely) to be of God, but more or less clearly, as each has inward experience that the dimensions of sin are not so much special as all but universal after this manner. We are all alike of one blood, soul, kind. Ye are all kin to each, each to all. Ye are all members of the same family. He who touches the life of his kind to sustain his own, violates his own life, the life and image of God. He violates the soul, the soul of mankind, his own soul also. And on all mankind, as well as on him, must the judgment fall. A father's and mother's soul is in the interpretation of all his works. It is God's greatest creation, and to touch all mankind, individually and collectively. Whatever is to come of the act of shedding man's blood for food, is to be of God. He may use man, as his instrumentality, or he may not. But he is to avenge, in the universal consequences of the violation of the sanctity of the human soul, the image of the divine. And the mode in which these consequences are to manifest themselves is indicated (not perhaps obscurely) to be of God, but more or less clearly, as each has inward experience that the dimensions of sin are not so much special as all but universal after this manner. We are all alike of one blood, soul, kind. Ye are all kin to each, each to